DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 435 857 CE 079 459

AUTHOR	Gutierrez, Michael
TITLE	The Role of Community Colleges in the One-Stop Career Center System. Four Case Studies. National Coalition of Advanced Technology Centers Report Series Volume 1, Number 5.
INSTITUTION	National Coalition of Advanced Technology Centers, Waco, TX.
ISBN	ISBN-1-57837-043-4
PUB DATE	1997-06-00
NOTE	43p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Career Counseling; Career Development; Career Education; Case Studies; *Community Colleges; *Cooperative Programs; Coordination; *Education Work Relationship; Educational Research; *Employment Services; Federal Legislation; *Job Placement; Job Search Methods; *Labor Force Development; Labor Market; Occupational Information; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This report studies how public community colleges in different states are approaching and fitting into the one-stop career center system (OSCCS). The comparison study analyzes state and federal legislation to determine the following: OSCCS development; how OSCCs are involving public community and technical colleges; the different roles these colleges can assume within the OSCCS; and the pros and cons of OSCCS for these colleges. Chapter 1 addresses what is wrong with the work force development system. It covers the work force development system bureaucracy and creation of an integrated delivery system. Chapter 2 paints an historical picture of the work force development system in the United States. Chapter 3 covers the composition of the OSCCS. Chapter 4 depicts the history of public community and technical colleges and their role as work force development entities. It also compares the services of public community and technical colleges with what is required to function as a U.S. Department of Labor-approved OSCCS. Chapter 5 presents case studies of four states: Iowa, North Carolina, Oregon, and Texas, analyzing the role of public community colleges within the OSCCS in each state. Chapter 6 concludes the report and lists the following recommendations: pass federal block grant legislation; allow a sliding scale for services; market the OSCCS; link the one-stop, school-to-work, and skill standards development initiatives; and make community colleges the preferred provider of training services for the OSCCS. (60 references) (YLB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 435 857

THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE ONE-STOP CAREER CENTER SYSTEM

Four Case Studies

The National Coalition of Advanced Technology Centers

Michael Gutierrez

Volume 1, Number 5, of the National Coalition of Advanced Technology Centers Report Series

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

June 1997

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A Gutierrez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 079 459

© 1997, Center for Occupational Research and Development, Inc., Waco, Texas

CORD Communications, Inc.
Customer Relations
P. O. Box 21206
Waco, Texas 76702-1206
800/231-3015

Printed in the United States of America

ISBN 1-57837-043-4

CONTENTS

Chapter 1: What's Wrong with the Workforce Development System? 1
- Workforce Development System Bureaucracy 2
- Creation of an Integrated Delivery System 2
- Scope of Report 4

Chapter 2: The Workforce Development System: The Divergence of Education and Job Training 5
- Historical Perspective on Job Training Programs 5
- Current Job Training System 9
- Differences Between Education and Job Training 10

Chapter 3: Composition of One-Stop Career Center Systems 15
- Principles of the One-Stop Career Center System 15
- Services Available Through the One-Stop Career Center System 16
- Status of Federal Legislation 17

Chapter 4: Training in the Community College 19
- History of the Community College 19
- Characteristics of the Community College 21
- Community Colleges as Workforce Development Providers 22
- Community Colleges and One-Stop Career Center Systems 23

Chapter 5: Case Studies 25
- Texas 26
- Iowa 29
- North Carolina 31
- Oregon 33

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations 35
- Conclusions 35
- Recommendations 36

Bibliography 37

CHAPTER 1

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM?

The United States' economic competitiveness depends on its ability to properly invest in its greatest natural resource—people. After the Great Depression, economic policy concentrated on finding jobs for people to reduce the unemployment rate. In the 1980s, problems linked to loss of competitiveness in international markets, mounting trade deficits, slow productivity growth, persistent poverty in inner cities and rural areas, a shortage of properly trained skilled workers, and an aging workforce prompted a change in the policy debate. Policymakers felt compelled to improve the education and job training system. This resulted in economic policy that focused on investing in human capital, both as a way to encourage overall economic growth and as a way to expand opportunities for the economically disadvantaged. [1]

In addition to the challenge of improving the workforce development system, social influences continue to impact new federal and state legislative agendas. This is an era in which citizens demand and advocate "less government." This means federal and state policy will prescribe that the workforce development system do more with less funding and be increasingly accountable for the outcomes of all its programs.

Recently a number of reform initiatives in basic and vocational education, school-to-work transition, job training, and the labor market system have begun to move the nation toward a more comprehensive approach to workforce development. Workforce development is a vast array of programs. It encompasses all the preparatory activities that contribute to the successful development of a skilled labor force. These activities include:

- primary and secondary education;
- postsecondary education, including associate degree and certificate programs;
- job training by both public and private sector sources; and
- a labor market information system in which employers can post and workers can obtain information about available jobs.[2]

In contrast to other countries, the United States has always taken a piecemeal approach to workforce development. The result of this approach has been the development of a large collection of education and job training programs that often differ only in target population. Inevitably, this has produced a fragmented system that confuses and frustrates the customer.[3] For

---

[1] Roger J. Vaughan, "Education, Training, and Labor Markets: A Policy Perspective," *NCEE Brief*, No. 8 (August 1990), p. 1.

[2] Deanna T. Schexnayder, *An Emerging Texas Workforce Development System* (Austin: University of Texas at Austin, Center for the Study of Human Resources, 1996), p. 1.

[3] The customer can denote an individual seeking to upgrade his or her skills or an employer looking for either skilled workers or a program to train incumbent workers.

example, "Employers seeking job applicants with specialized skills can identify no single point of contact within the myriad of existing job training and employment programs where persons could be trained to meet the employer's needs. Conversely, a person interested in receiving such training cannot easily determine that such job skills are in demand or locate the providers offering such training."[4]

Workforce Development System Bureaucracy

Unless a person has tried to seek services through the current workforce development system, it is difficult to comprehend the endless red tape that can be encountered. The experiences of Sylvia, a fictitious character seeking proper service as a customer of the workforce development system, illustrates how frustrating the current maze can be.

Sylvia is a single parent with a dead-end job making minimum wage. To arrive at work, Sylvia relies on public transportation every day. She depends on friends and family to baby-sit her child because the neighborhood child care center is too expensive. Her desire is to obtain a higher-paying position, but without a high school diploma or other specialized training, no company will even interview her because of her lack of skills. What is she to do?

Unaware of where to start, she visits her old high school counselor for assistance. Sylvia takes an unpaid vacation day from work because she accrues no benefits. The high school counselor refers her to a community-based organization for training to take the GED exam. Because she has no car, she takes the bus back home to take care of her child. Later in the week, Sylvia takes another unpaid vacation day to enroll in the GED program at the community-based organization. Sylvia informs the case worker that she will need child care assistance to be able to complete the program at night. Because she is a single mother below the poverty line, Sylvia is informed that she would probably qualify for food stamps and other health and human services. Sylvia is delighted until she is informed that she will have to go to the Health and Human Services office downtown.

This particular scenario is quite basic, yet it is easy to see why any individual could become frustrated with the lack of a cohesive education and job training system in this country. The scenario could easily be complicated by depicting Sylvia's daily social and economic pressures. How would the scenario change if her boss fired her because she missed too many days either to care for her sick child or to upgrade her skills? Regardless, we can easily assume that Sylvia would encounter many more pitfalls in her journey for proper education, skills training, and health and human services benefits.

Creation of an Integrated Delivery System

Recently, a number of policy leaders across the United States have advocated a more systematic approach to workforce development to keep our businesses and workers competitive in the global economy and to erase the confusion for an individual trying to work his or her way through the bewildering web of the system.[5] Presently, it is difficult for even the most highly

---

[4] Schexnayder, *An Emerging Texas Workforce Development System*, p. 1.

[5] W. Norton Grubb, *Learning to Work: The Case for Reintegrating Job Training and Education* (New York:

educated individual to figure out the myriad of education and job training programs that exist in a given area. These programs can range from postsecondary certificate programs at community colleges to short-term training programs sponsored by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). People living in low socioeconomic areas have even greater difficulty obtaining the proper information relating to their education and training needs. As we saw with Sylvia, one of the greatest hurdles facing customers of the education and training system is the lack of a single point of access for service.

The U.S. Department of Labor, in partnership with states and many local areas, is working to deliver an integrated service delivery system for job seekers and employers in an effort to transform the fragmented array of existing programs through an organizing vehicle termed the one-stop career center system. Customers of the one-stop career center system should be provided with a single point of access for information and services in:

- job search assistance,
- job referral,
- job placement,
- testing and assessment,
- counseling,
- job bank and labor market information,
- career exploration,
- information on education and job training programs,
- "consumer reports" on each education and job training program, and
- health and human service programs.[6]

Where does education fit into the one-stop career center system model? Historically, community and technical colleges have played an active role in economic and workforce development. Employers have looked to community colleges as a source for trained workers, including graduates of both vocational and general education programs. However, policy at all levels has separated job training from education since the 1960s. The federal government developed the existing workforce development system by "establishing job training programs that are distinct from, and fiscally independent of the education programs funded largely by states and localities in high schools, two- and four-year colleges, technical institutes, and area vocational schools."[7] In the process, important distinctions emerged between education and job training.

Russell Sage Books, 1996), p. 1.

[6] U.S. Department of Labor, *The One-Stop Career Center System Fact Sheet*, Washington, D.C., April 1995, p. 1.

[7] Grubb, *Learning to Work*, p. 1.

Scope of Report

This report will comparatively study how public community colleges in different states are approaching and fitting into the one-stop career center system. The following four states will be analyzed: Iowa, North Carolina, Oregon, and Texas. The comparison study will analyze:

- state and federal legislation for one-stop career center system development,
- how one-stop career centers are involving public community and technical colleges,
- the different roles public community and technical colleges can assume within the one-stop career center system, and
- the pros and cons of one-stop career centers for public community and technical colleges.

Chapter 2 paints a historical picture of the workforce development system in the United States. Chapter 3 covers the composition of the one-stop career center system. Chapter 4 depicts the history of public community and technical colleges and their role as workforce development entities. Chapter 4 also compares the services of public community and technical colleges with what is required to function as a U.S. Department of Labor approved one-stop career center system. Chapter 5 presents case studies of the four states mentioned above, analyzing the role of public community colleges within the one-stop career center system in each state. Chapter 6 concludes the report and lists recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

THE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM: THE DIVERGENCE OF EDUCATION AND JOB TRAINING

Since the 1960s, the institutions in the United States that offer employment services, skill development, and skill upgrading through education and job training have expanded in number and in complexity. Some of the training occurs through secondary schools and their vocational education and tech prep programs. Most of the occupationally specific training within the educational system takes place at postsecondary institutions and vocational schools.[1]

Outside formal schooling, federally funded programs such as JTPA provide short-term job training to various segments of the population as a "second chance." These include individuals who are economically disadvantaged, dislocated workers, out-of-school youth, high school dropouts, and in-school at-risk youth. Even at the state and local levels, some areas have developed their own training programs to help spur economic development.[2] For example, many times, the training is industry-specific to help lure companies from other parts of the country. Job training policies even overlap with those of several welfare-to-work initiatives, a further set of programs providing job training to welfare recipients. Overall, job training and welfare-related programs are provided by community-based organizations, trade unions, private firms, community and technical colleges, and other institutions.[3]

This "second chance" system serves as a mediator between those seeking employment and employers, using short doses of education, training, and job search assistance to help the disadvantaged find work and access to learning on the job.[4]

Historical Perspective on Job Training Programs

Instead of developing a comprehensive job training system, the United States has created a plethora of individual programs, each created to fill a specific skills gap. "In large part, the expansion of job training programs has reflected a concern with particular economic problems, especially those of unemployment, underemployment, and poverty."[5] In response to unemployment and recession, job training programs have been looked at as a way for individuals to gain skills in new occupational areas within a short period of time. The United States has

---

[1] W. Norton Grubb, *Learning to Work: The Case for Reintegrating Job Training and Education* (New York: Russell Sage Books, 1996), p. 8.

[2] Lorraine M. McDonnell and W. Norton Grubb, *Education and Training for Work: The Policy Instruments and the Institutions* (Berkeley: University of California, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1991), p. 1.

[3] Ibid.

[11] Anthony P. Carnevale, Leila J. Gainer, and Janice Villet, *Training in America: The Organization and Strategic Role of Training* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990), p. 12.

[12] Grubb, *Learning to Work*, p. 2.

continued to react to periods of recession and unemployment by creating alternative job training programs as solutions to individual problems. Even in the 1990s, policymakers created stopgap training programs for individuals unemployed due to economic conditions, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement or military base closings.

Why has the United States not taken a proactive approach in the development of a comprehensive workforce development system? Several factors have affected the decision-making process:

- The United States was embroiled in the Cold War, which occupied time and resources from this nation's policymakers.
- It is the nature of government. Policymakers react to the most pressing need relevant to their constituents. Moreover, they react to the adage, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."
- The United States has enjoyed prosperity as the world's greatest economic superpower.
- Industry has relied on the "mass production" model. Employees did not always have to be highly skilled to earn a decent living and have a good standard of living.
- The United States operates under a free enterprise system. Many subscribe to the belief that the market itself will dictate when and if workers need skills development or skill upgrades.

Nevertheless, "several different strands of development have created the current system of job training programs—in reality, a nonsystem with a bewildering variety of purposes, services, and funding."[6] The first manifestation of the modern job training system appeared with the enactment of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. Although this program never served more than 12,000 people, it established a precedent by offering federally subsidized training in concert with loans to companies that agreed to relocate or expand their plants and facilities into impoverished areas.[7]

As a stronger response to the 1960-1961 recession, the more ambitious manpower programs followed. The Manpower Development Training Act of 1962 established training programs administered and funded by the U.S. Department of Labor. These programs were completely separate from federal support of vocational education.[8] "An independent funding mechanism for programs outside the schools was established in part because of the poor reputation of vocational education and in part because of a general feeling that secondary schools were not equipped to provide nontraditional training for adults."[9]

The manpower programs targeted dislocated workers who had lost their jobs due to technological changes. Individuals could receive up to a year of skill training, either classroom or on-the-job. This new stream of federal funding added to the diversity of institutions providing workforce training. No longer was an individual bound to the secondary schools and community and technical colleges for career training. Hundreds of community-based organizations and proprietary schools sprang up to give greater choice, but this also added to the complexity of the ever-growing education and job training system. Moreover, with unions and private firms

---

[13] Ibid.

[14] Carnevale, Gainer, and Villet, *Training in America*, p. 12.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Grubb, *Learning to Work*, p. 9.

benefiting from public funds, the manpower programs helped to erode the boundary between public and private programs.[10]

Simultaneously, President Johnson began his war on poverty. As the Vietnam War created a demand for greater skilled workers to meet production needs, unemployment levels dropped, the recession subsided, and policymakers shifted the focus of their policies to poor youth and minorities.[11] The expansion of welfare programs during the 1960s brought the realization that poverty was not likely to just vanish. Job training became one of the viable solutions to end welfare. However, because the problems of poverty, unemployment, and underemployment are closely related, it is not surprising that many of the manpower programs appeared similar in nature despite catering to different segments of the population.[12]

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1963 offered programs that encouraged individuals to work. New and specialized programs were added as amendments each year until 1967 due to reauthorizations. The following programs were created under the Economic Opportunity Act:

- The Neighborhood Youth Corps offered part-time job experiences, basic education, and occupational skill training combined with health and support services.
- Operation Mainstream provided elderly workers with part-time jobs in rural conservation projects.
- New Careers offered public-sector jobs to the economically disadvantaged;
- The Special Impact Program focused federal training dollars on selected urban slum areas.
- The Concentrated Employment Program created a complete range of employment and training programs and support services targeted at rural and urban areas with very high unemployment rates.[13]

Like the manpower programs, these programs sidestepped the traditional training offered through the vocational education programs at secondary and postsecondary institutions.

President Johnson's era of antipoverty programs ended in 1967 with the authorization of the Work Incentive (WIN) program as an amendment to the Social Security Act. The WIN program provided training; support services, such as child care and transportation; and job placement assistance to eligible recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).[14] Although poorly funded, the WIN program made it possible for welfare recipients to work.

During President Nixon's administration, policymakers wanted to control the rising administrative costs caused by funding each job training program separately. Not unlike recent efforts to establish a block grant for all workforce programs, President Nixon planned to decategorize all the job training programs into a single block grant, shifting administrative control to state and local governments, and cut expenditures. However, a severe recession in 1970-1971 caused the president to sign a $2.25 billion, two-year employment program under the

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Carnevale, Gainer, and Villet, *Training in America*, p. 12.

[19] Grubb, *Learning to Work*, p. 1.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Carnevale, Gainer, and Villet, *Training in America*, p. 14.

Emergency Employment Act of 1971. This brought the total of federal expenditures to $5 billion in FY 1973 for employment and training programs.[15] By this time, issues related to cost and program effectiveness caused policymakers at every government level to reevaluate the federal job training system for much-needed reform.

In 1973, the manpower programs were consolidated under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). "Like the programs it combined, CETA provided little role for state governments and gave local administrative units greater decision-making power over the types of training offered, the groups of individuals served, and the institutions offering training and other services."[16] CETA gave local authorities the ability to tailor training programs to specific needs. Although mainly job training programs, CETA allowed for job-creation activities and subsidized employers by paying program participants stipends at least equal to the minimum wage. CETA provided the following:

- a program of job training and related services for the most severely disadvantaged and for eligible veterans in high unemployment areas;
- special federal training programs for Native Americans and migrant workers; and
- a reauthorized Job Corps program.[17]

CETA charged the National Commission for Manpower Policy to make recommendations about meeting the employment needs and goals of the nation.

CETA was marred by a poor public image due to corruption, poor management, and lack of effective programs. To save the programs, Congress amended CETA in 1978 to include:

- limitations on the discretionary authority of local and state governments;
- changes in public service employment eligibility requirements to target only the poor; and
- development of a new private sector initiative program to bring representatives from private businesses into partnership with local elected officials in planning and administering programs.[18]

Unable to overcome CETA's bad publicity, Congress passed the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in 1982 as a replacement for CETA. To help curb corruption, JTPA gives states much of the oversight authority once reserved for the federal government. State governments designate local service delivery areas (SDAs) that can establish priorities on how a portion of the federal funding should be spent. Moreover, private industry councils (PICs), with a majority of members from the private sector, are in equal partnership with local elected officials for administering local programs. The PICs are responsible for policy guidance and program oversight and must approve SDA training plans. PICs also have the option to administer the JTPA programs directly, but fewer than 20 percent take on that responsibility.[19] JTPA prohibits public service employment and limits work experience programs. It prohibits stipends for

---

[22] Ibid.

[23] Grubb, *Learning to Work*, p. 9.

[24] Carnevale, Gainer, and Villet, *Training in America*, p. 14.

[25] Ibid, p. 16.

[26] Grubb, *Learning to Work*, p. 10.

participants, although need-based allowances and support services can be offered up to the 30 percent limit on administrative and support service costs.[20]

It was hoped JTPA would improve program effectiveness by mandating performance standards on all its programs. Each SDA is responsible for its outcomes and required to meet federal standards. "States could also add standards of their own and could use either a federal adjustment model or one of their own design to take into account the demographic and labor market characteristics of individual SDAs."[21]

The Reagan administration also tried to get welfare recipients back to work by providing grants to states that developed their own programs to get people back to work.

> Although all the state programs varied, most relied heavily on job search (short-term assistance in applying for work but no other training or support services) and work experience or on-the-job training, both accomplished through short-term placements. Although 84 percent of the programs offered vocational skills training and 72 percent provided post-high school education, in practice only 2.3 percent of the welfare recipients participating in these programs received any skill training, and only 1.6 percent enrolled in postsecondary education.[22]

This strategy led to services focused on job search instead of education, job training, or other services.

The trend of establishing job training programs through the welfare system continued with the Family Support Act of 1988, which created Job Opportunities for Basic Skills (JOBS). JOBS allows states the flexibility to determine what services to provide, ranging from job search to work experience, counseling, child care, and other support services. JOBS also mandates participation by all AFDC recipients who are single heads of households with no dependents under three years of age.[23]

Current Job Training System

Over its history, the job training system has demonstrated an increasing involvement of employers in its programs. Legislative changes have progressively attempted to strengthen the relationship between the job training system and employers, because early studies showed that services had little or no positive effect on improving employment status when clients learned outside the context of a job or prospective job.[24] In some respects, this notion was carried too far in some program areas. For example, too much on-the-job training with little basic skill upgrading causes a program to function essentially as a job placement service instead of job training. In the long run, too little basic skill upgrading may be detrimental to the client, because he or she still lacks the necessary skills and will always be overlooked for promotions. Thus, his or her earnings will remain static and even diminish as a result of inflation.

---

[27] Carnevale, Gainer, and Villet, *Training in America*, p. 16.

[28] Grubb, *Learning to Work*, p. 11.

[29] Ibid, p. 12.

[30] Ibid, p. 13.

[31] Carnevale, Gainer, and Villet, *Training in America*, p. 16.

Nationwide, the lack of a highly skilled entry-level workforce has created a window of opportunity for the job training system as a "second chance" for the unemployed or underemployed. More and more employers desire entry-level workers to possess the SCANS skills in addition to the basics in reading, writing, and arithmetic. As skilled entry-level workers become harder for employers to find, more and better jobs become available to the disadvantaged and dislocated workers who are clients of the job training system. "The emerging strength of this system stems from the fact that its goals of opportunity and social justice are increasingly consistent with the public and private pursuit of the nation's economic competitiveness."[25]

Current job training programs are primarily funded under the Job Training Partnership Act and, to some extent, the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Act. Operating for several years, JTPA emphasizes public-private partnerships, performance standards, coordination of training services with other human service agencies, state and local administrative control, and access to work and career development rather than welfare.[26]

Nevertheless, the outcome of federal and state policies since the 1960s has been a myriad of job training programs instead of a coherent workforce development system. After closely examining employment and training programs funded by the federal government, the U.S. General Accounting Office counted 163 programs spending $20.4 billion.[27] Although this study included job service and education programs like literacy, it did not include programs initiated by state or local funding. The sheer number of programs demonstrates how fragmented the training system has become.

Differences Between Education and Job Training

Since the 1960s, the federal government has developed a training system distinct from and fiscally independent of the traditional educational system composed of high schools, community and technical colleges, universities, and area vocational schools. Unlike federal job training programs, the educational system is subsidized largely by state and local taxes. In the process of developing the job training system through federal policy and local implementation, important distinctions emerged between education and job training. "The difference is not always clear, since some short-term, job-specific education programs look quite similar to job training; for example, some short-term programs in fields like clerical skills, computer applications, and electronics in both JTPA programs and area vocational schools last around fifteen weeks."[28] Norton Grubb of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education makes a strong argument for at least seven differences between education and job training.

First, job training programs are generally much shorter than education programs, usually lasting approximately ten to fifteen weeks. In contrast, the most common postsecondary education program at community colleges is the two-year associate degree. Even one-year

---

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid, p. 17.

[34] U.S. General Accounting Office, *Multiple Employment Training Programs: Major Overhaul Needed to Create a More Efficient, Customer-Driven System* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office, 1995), p. 1.

[35] W. Norton Grubb, *Working in the Middle: Strengthening Education and Training for the Mid-Skilled Labor Force* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996, p. 111.

certificate programs involve two semesters of full-time enrollment. "Of course, student attendance patterns can reduce these longer education programs to individual courses, and area vocational schools often offer short programs of part-time attendance over one semester of about fifteen weeks; therefore, some education programs are no more intensive than most job training programs."[29]

Second, education programs, particularly in community and technical colleges and area vocational schools, offer open enrollment, and services are generally available to anyone. On the other hand, job training programs are open only to those who are eligible, mainly the disadvantaged and those harder to serve. For example, the long-term unemployed or dislocated workers under JTPA or welfare-to-work clients are usually deficient in one or more basic skills and typically lack high school diplomas.[30]

Third, education programs have become institutionalized in the American culture. Whether delivered by a high school or community college, education programs have legitimacy because they belong to the formal educational system that has been around so long. "In contrast, job training services are offered in a bewildering variety of education institutions, community-based organizations, firms, unions, and proprietary schools, making it difficult to determine how services are organized and provided."[31]

Fourth, the services provided in education programs are relatively standard, offering classroom instruction in both academic and vocational courses. Job training programs offer a greater variety of services. They include

- classroom instruction in basic (or remedial) academic subjects like reading, writing, and math;
- vocational skills training;
- on-the-job training, where individuals in work sites learn on the job;
- work experience, where individuals work for a short period of time;
- job search assistance, where clients receive training in looking for work, writing resumes, filing job applications, interviewing for jobs;
- career counseling; and
- "life skills" training, where clients learn how to plan.[32]

Another distinction between education and job training lies in the area of job placement. Placement services are more common in job training institutions than in educational institutions. For instance, those in educational institutions are more likely to assert that they are responsible for educating students and not for finding them employment. On the other hand, those in job training institutions are more likely to assume the responsibility for placing individuals as well as training them in the related field.[33]

---

[36] Grubb, *Learning to Work*, p. 3.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Grubb, *Working in the Middle*, p. 112.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Grubb, *Learning to Work*, p. 3.

Fifth, the goals of education programs are broad and typically encompass political, moral, and intellectual purposes as well as occupational preparation. In contrast, job training programs focus exclusively on preparing individuals to become employable and helping them find employment. In programs that deal specifically with welfare-to-work recipients, the single goal is to remove people from the welfare rolls by getting them employed as quickly as possible. "Because the goal of job training programs is so unambiguous and because job training yields no intrinsic benefits (no one would declare that being in a job training program is fun, a social activity, or a normal part of growing up, as Americans might say about schools and colleges), there has been a long history of evaluating programs to ascertain their effectiveness."[34] There is no question that job training programs have been under scrutiny more than education programs. Consequently, program evaluations for job training programs have become much more sophisticated than those for education programs. Evaluation results influence public policy in the job training realm more than in the educational realm because job training programs lack the political support that educational programs enjoy. Education programs get widespread community support because they encourage parental involvement and benefit students directly, whereas job training programs usually bear little direct benefit to individual taxpayers.[35]

Sixth, job training is generally a federal initiative, both at the policy and fiscal levels, although programs are administered at the state and local levels. "The important exceptions are welfare-related programs like those in JOBS, which are partly state funded because welfare (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) has always been funded through grants requiring states to match federal revenues in order to receive federal funds."[36] In contrast, virtually all public education programs at all levels are supported through state and local taxes, with federal funding composing a tiny fraction of the overall budget. As a result of the two distinct funding streams, each delivery system has been administered independently, ensuring little or no coordination at the state or local levels until federal legislation mandated the programs to do so under JTPA and the reauthorization of the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990. Moreover, "states often view job training programs as federal programs rather than as 'theirs.'"[37]

Seventh, job training programs differ from education programs in that they represent an independent system, a "safety net" or "second-chance" system analogous to but disconnected from the "first-chance" educational system. "Over the course of one hundred fifty years, the education system in the United States has developed a well-articulated series of offerings from kindergarten (now often extended to preschool programs) to the university level."[38] For those who drop out of the first-chance system or leave without adequate skills, the job training system offers a chance to enter the workforce with a set of skills. At the same time, the job training system is much younger, is funded at a much lower level, is disorganized due to the bewildering numbers of programs, has lower status, and has withstood an inordinate amount of scrutiny and political pressure for success to remove people from public assistance. As a result, each presidential administration has attempted its revisions and additions to the job training system,

---

[41] Ibid, p. 4.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid, p. 5.

[45] Ibid.

creating a vast array of programs lacking the stability of the educational system.[39]

This divergence of the education and job training systems has been counterproductive to the development of a unified workforce development system. For example, there is the perception of the job training system duplicating services already offered within the existing educational system, creating inefficiency and government waste. Moreover, sophisticated problems such as turf issues and lack of program coordination between agencies at all levels have added to the confusion of services available to customers of the workforce development system. The problem is explained best in *America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages*: "The network of public training activities in the country has thus been created as a result of unrelated education, social, and economic development goals rather than from any overall vision of human resource development. . . . The result is a crazy quilt of competing and overlapping policies and programs, with no coherent system of standardization of information exchange service on which various providers and agencies can rely."[40] However, Grubb argues that very little duplication takes place because education and job training programs vary in services available and they target different populations. More importantly, there is an overall shortage of resources; the demand for training is higher than existing programs can supply. Against the issue of lack of program coordination, vast amounts of referral and contracting take place between secondary and postsecondary vocational programs. Grubb states that the biggest problem lies not in program inefficiency and waste, but in the lack of program effectiveness.

---

[46] Ibid.

[47] National Center on Education and the Economy, *America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department Of Labor, 1991), p. 53.

CHAPTER 3

COMPOSITION OF ONE-STOP CAREER CENTER SYSTEMS

More than 160 different federal programs provide some form of employment training assistance. The fragmented system of federal programs creates a variety of problems that hinder customers of workforce development, including

- duplication of services,
- lack of information on access,
- multiple administrative entities, and
- lack of an integrated client tracking system.

To address these problems, some states have made efforts to reorganize their service delivery systems to better coordinate services at the local level. Their efforts are hampered, however, by differences in program requirements and reluctance of competing program staffs to share information. To ameliorate the situation, local, state, and federal leaders must work together to establish common goals for employment training programs and yet allow communities the flexibility to develop service delivery systems tailored to local needs.

One-stop career centers offer the potential to be an important step toward a rational employment strategy. In 1994, the U.S. Department of Labor, in partnership with states and local areas, articulated a concept and vision for an integrated, high-quality delivery system that included such centers and late that year awarded one-stop career center grants to 25 states. Six states received three-year, multimillion dollar awards to fully implement one-stop systems, while the 19 others received one-year awards to support the planning and development of such systems. By late January 1996, all states and jurisdictions had received at least planning and development grants for one-stop system building.[48] Thirty-three states will have received one-stop implementation grants by July 1997.

Principles of the One-Stop Career Center System

The Department of Labor's design of a one-stop career center system follows the four principles for state and local areas to adequately implement effective workforce development services:

- Universality—All population groups will have access to a wide array of job seeking and employment development services, including the initial assessment of skills and abilities, self-help information relating to career exploration and skill requirements of various occupations, consumer report information on the performance of local education and training

---

[48] U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, One-Stop Center Team, *One-Stop Quarterly Report: An Update on the Status of Employment and Training System Building* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, October 1996), p. 2.

providers, and quality labor market information.

- Customer Choice—Giving customers choices is critical to a one-stop career center system. Employers and job seekers will have choices in where and how they can obtain information and services and will have access to the information they need to make informed choices among education and training options.
- Integration—A one-stop career center system offers a seamless approach to service delivery, providing access to services under a wide array of employment, training, and education programs. This program integration also requires integration of governance structures at both the state and local levels.
- Performance Driven/Outcome Based Measures—To ensure customer satisfaction, one-stop career center systems must have clear outcome measures and consequences for failing to meet them.[2]

Although states and local areas are encouraged to be creative in designing their one-stop career center systems, it is imperative that these centers work through existing programs rather than establish new programs that compete with those that already exist. Along those lines, states might elect to establish their networks of one-stop centers in existing service delivery areas such as those from JTPA or Tech Prep, or develop local workforce development boards to establish an integrated workforce development system. Indeed, proposed federal legislation would require that a one-stop career center system be established in the workforce development area of any local workforce development board.

Services Available Through the One-Stop Career Center System

The Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, is responsible for the accountability of one-stop career center systems grants nationwide. The one-stop career center grants are funded in large part through federal funding authorized under the Wagner-Peyser Act.

The one-stop career center system is designed to provide a comprehensive system of delivery of employment and training services. A one-stop customer is provided with a single point of access for services, including

- job search assistance;
- job referral;
- job placement;
- testing and assessment;
- career counseling;
- labor market information;
- job bank and labor market information;

---

[49] U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *The One-Stop Career Center System Fact Sheet* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1995), pp., 1-2.

- information on education and training programs;
- help filing initial claims for unemployment insurance; and
- enrollment in job training and retraining programs, prevocational and basic skills training, GED preparation, English as a second language, and summer youth on-the-job training programs.[3]

The goal is for at least 80 percent of the civilian population to have access to these services via a one-stop career center.

An added service for customers of these one-stop career centers is a performance report on how each service provider measures up against established standards and how customers value the outcome of these services. Customers will then be able to make a choice on the best service available for their needs based on the quality of the program.

The one-stop career center system can be seen as the vehicle for bringing together fragmented education, employment, and training programs into a seamless delivery system. It could very well be the gateway to labor market information and to education and job training programs for customers of the workforce development system. In many respects, one-stop career centers could also be a link between the school-to-work initiative and workforce development by transitioning young people into adult education, training, and employment.

Status of Federal Legislation

Two bills, HR 1617 and S 143, were considered by the U.S. Congress in 1995 and 1996 to consolidate federal funding for all education and job training under block grants. Instead of earmarking federal funds for programs such as vocational education and JTPA, block grants would allow states more flexibility on how funds could be spent. Both bills included specific language for a local workforce development board (HR 1617) or a local partnership (S 143) to set policy and operate an integrated career center system or one-stop career centers. No consolidated workforce development system legislation passed the Congress in 1996, however.

Without such federal legislation, some states have taken the initiative and integrated the one-stop career center concept into their own state legislation, including designating workforce development areas and advocating the establishment of local workforce development boards.

The role of education within a one-stop career center system varies from state to state. In some areas, local workforce development boards

- promote and articulate with school-to-work activities,
- select education representatives to serve as board members, and
- designate postsecondary institutions to operate as the one-stop career center system.

However, there is no set policy on how education will interface with the one-stop career center system in each state. This issue will be discussed further in Chapter 5, following an explanation in Chapter 4 of how community colleges function as workforce development providers.

---

[50] U.S. Department of Labor, *One-Stop Quarterly Report*, pp. 1-2.

CHAPTER 4

TRAINING IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

As of 1995, over 1000 public community existed in the United States. In most states, a public community college can be found within commuting distance of virtually everyone.[1] In areas that have had a community colleges for many years, it is not unusual for residents to have gone to the campus for some course or activity or to have had a friend or relative do so. Because of their great number, open door admissions policy, and focus on workforce training, community colleges play a key role in postsecondary education and job training and are vitally relevant to many areas of social life.

History of the Community College

Community colleges first appeared around the turn of the twentieth century. The idea of a public two-year college began in the nineteenth century with the backing of many university presidents and other influential educators. Their intent was "to free the university of the basic general education curriculum so that the 'lofty' missions of research and professional training could be pursued without distraction."[2] Experts believed that, as an extension of high school, junior colleges would increase educational opportunities for people with limited resources.

To a large extent, the first community colleges did function as an extension of high school in the United States. These early community colleges were stigmatized as "dumping grounds" for people who could not attend universities because they did not qualify academically or financially.

Despite the negative image of the early two-year colleges, the advantages of having such a college nearby operated as a catalyst for the growth in numbers. The advantages were numerous:

- they gave access to an academic program near home;
- they allowed parents to keep a closer watch on their children;
- they allowed youths to attend college while working at a family business or farm;
- they gave local officials some political control over higher education; and
- local citizens perceived a more direct and immediate return on tax dollars rather than see their money benefit some unknown college town.[3]

The early two-year colleges were largely liberal-arts-oriented institutions that focused their efforts on courses that could be transferred to four-year colleges and universities. Over the years, the orientation of the public two-year colleges changed. Through a process that Kevin Dougherty has termed "vocationalization," the colleges became "comprehensive institutions," adding

---

[51] Arthur M. Cohen, *Projecting the Future of Community Colleges* (Los Angeles: ERIC Digest, 1996), p. 1.

[52] Glen Gabert, *Community Colleges in the 1990s* (Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1991), p. 8.

[3] Ibid, p. 9.

programs in adult education, community education, remedial education, and most important, occupational/vocational education.[4]

The vocationalization of community colleges began during the Great Depression, when many community colleges offered vocational education to students who entered the community colleges due to the massive shortage of jobs. California led the charge in vocational education. The state's vocational education offerings rose from 16 courses in 1916 to 1,725 in 1929-1930, and 4,116 in 1936-1937. Although other states offered vocational education courses, nationwide registration in vocational education programs remained below 15 percent of the overall community college enrollment.[5] Few could match the growth of California's community colleges. While the fledgling vocational education programs were trying to take off, the early two-year colleges were still struggling to legitimize themselves as a viable option to the four-year college and university. Most two-year college presidents wanted their institutions to be reputable in the area of credit transfer and looked at vocational education as "dumb-bell" courses that would only lower the standards of the two-year college system.

The shortage of skilled workers during World War II slowly increased the importance of vocational education within two-year colleges. In some ways, the public two-year colleges advanced vocational education as a matter of economic survival. Because they were losing enrollments due to males entering the war, the public two-year colleges needed to become more innovative in bringing in revenue. For example, many of the institutions contracted with the military for vocational training.[6] After World War II, new vocational programs were created to accommodate the influx of veterans seeking skilled training for jobs.

The concept of affordable college education advocated by college presidents in the late nineteenth century finally became public policy endorsed by the president of the United States. In 1947, the Commission on Higher Education, established by President Truman, endorsed the concept of college education for the general public, not just for people who could afford the traditional four-year college education. The Truman Commission recommended that public community colleges be a vehicle for making this feasible. "The Truman Commission is considered by many to be the watershed event, marking the transition from junior colleges and vocational schools to comprehensive community colleges. As a matter of fact, it was the Truman Commission that recommended community college as a more appropriate name than junior college."[7]

Enrollments in vocational education programs continued to rise dramatically after 1960. "Enrollments rose from 20 percent of all community college students in 1959 to 29 percent in 1968 and to 40 to 60 percent in the mid-1980s. Meanwhile, the proportion of community college graduates receiving vocational degrees and certificates rose from 49 percent in 1970-1971 to 65 percent in 1978-1979."[8]

---

[4] Kevin J. Dougherty, *The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), p. 191.

[5] Ibid, p. 192.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Gabert, *Community Colleges in the 1990s*, p. 10.

[8] Dougherty, *The Contradictory College*, p. 191.

With larger enrollments came a greater demand for variety in the types of vocational education programs offered. Community colleges began offering courses in white-collar professions, including secretarial work, accounting, and teaching. In addition, courses preparing individuals for traditional blue-collar occupations, such as welding and auto repair, were offered in an effort to attract people from all sectors of the population.[9]

In the second half of the twentieth century, many public two-year colleges shifted their philosophy from being solely transfer-credit institutions to serving the training needs of the entire community. Programs in technical areas, such as computer programming, nursing, and medical technology, became part of the associate degree track. Most recently, many community colleges have expanded their workforce training services by providing customized contract training for employers, often at the work site. Customized contract training has become a steady source of revenue and a tool to help community colleges stay abreast of current technology and techniques required by industry. "In 1985, a survey conducted by the American Association of Community Colleges found that 75 percent of community colleges polled were involved in providing some sort of contract employee training for the private sector."[10]

Characteristics of the Community College

Community colleges distinguish themselves from universities and four-year colleges by a variety of factors. Community college policies appeal to both young adults just out of high school and incumbent workers because of the following characteristics:

- affordable tuition and fees;
- liberal and flexible admission policies;
- accessibility;
- a wide range of course offerings;
- comprehensive student support services; and
- flexibility of class scheduling, offering classes in the morning, afternoon, and evening.

These characteristics, especially the flexible scheduling, allow both full-time and part-time students to work while enrolled at the community college.[11]

The mission of community colleges is to provide comprehensive postsecondary education that is academically and financially accessible. The majority of community colleges offer more than preparation for university/four-year college transfer. Most tend to be responsive to the educational and training needs of their communities and deliver instructional and support programs to a broad range of students. These functions include:

- occupational training for entry-level jobs;
- skill upgrading and retraining;

---

[9] Ibid, p. 193.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Anthony P. Carnevale, Leila J. Gainer, and Janice Villet, *Training in America: The Organization and Strategic Role of Training* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990), p. 9.

- contract training for the private sector;
- partnerships with business, industry, labor, and government;
- education for personal growth;
- counseling, guidance, and other support services;
- programs for groups in special populations, such as disabled and the limited English speaking;
- basic skill development and remediation;
- articulation agreements with secondary schools, colleges, and universities; and
- general education.[12]

Community Colleges as Workforce Development Providers

Today's workforce is changing. Although 80 percent of the people who will be working in the year 2000 are already in the workforce, these individuals are likely to need retraining at some point to meet the changing demands of the economy. The largest natural resource in the United States is its people. Investing in people is the main component in economic development, and community colleges are in a position to provide the education and job training necessary to develop this resource.[13]

The role of community colleges in workforce development has expanded beyond traditional vocational education. Activities include roles as diverse as technical assistance for new and small businesses, Tech Prep programs articulated with high schools and four-year colleges/universities, facilitation of school-to-work programs, cooperative education programs, partnerships with states in economic development activities, and contract or customized training for business and industry.[14]

Community colleges have forged links with employers through contract training, in which the training is customized to the needs of the employer and classes are frequently offered at the worksite. "Community colleges have the ability to design customized job training programs to the specifications of a firm or business; thus they are capable of meeting varying needs of a community's business and industry and simultaneously providing economic development support to their communities."[15] In some areas, these training activities are part of an economic development center that allows the community college to be more entrepreneurial in its services and provides a critical tool for gaining additional revenue. In addition to customized training, these centers may offer small-business incubation, technology transfer, and business consulting and research. Small-business incubators allow community colleges to provide potential entrepreneurs with technical assistance, classes, and workshops on how to start a business. Initial

---

[12] Gabert, *Community Colleges in the 1990s*, p. 9.

[13] Diane Hirshberg, *The Role of the Community Colleges in Economic and Workforce Development* (Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1991), p. 1.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Jeffrey A. Cantor, *Apprenticeship and Community Colleges: Promoting Collaboration with Business, Labor and the Community for Workforce Training* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1993),p. 9.

office space, clerical staff support, and business consultation are offered for a reasonable fee. The economic development center can also serve as or be affiliated with an advanced technology center. Among the activities of the advanced technology center is technology transfer, consultation and training on introducing new production technologies. Advanced technology centers provide space to demonstrate and train employees in new technologies.[16]

Community Colleges and One-Stop Career Center Systems

Many community colleges have coordinated their efforts with job training programs. They often provide training services brokered through private industry councils (PICs) and funded through JTPA. In this role, community colleges provide vocational training, preemployment training, job readiness counseling and training, job search assistance, remedial/ESL instruction, and apprenticeship instruction.[17] Unfortunately, there are still deficiencies in overall coordination between federal job training and education programs.

Although local workforce development boards and one-stop career center systems are popping up in all fifty states, barriers against coordination with community colleges will still exist because of the fundamental differences between education and job training . "The real problem with existing job training programs is not that a component here or there is inadequate but that their offerings consist of a welter of different services, some job-specific training, some remedial instruction, some work experience, and some supportive services, none obviously more effective than any others and all poorly coordinated."[18] Moreover, these programs are often not linked to other services or further education and training, even though the programs are geared for individuals with substantial needs.

At most educational institutions, including community colleges, few resources are devoted to the areas of guidance, counseling, and career exploration. "Education institutions could learn much from job training programs about the importance of employment and of services like job placement."[19] Although these services are poorly constructed for students trying to enter the workforce, the development of school-to-work-sponsored programs and the labor market information system to be used by the one-stop career center system should help. The greatest effect will occur only if the weaknesses of the community colleges can be linked to the strengths of the one-stop career center system.

Together the one-stop career center and community college can offer a comprehensive array of employment-related services and connect the job training programs to other training and education opportunities rather than being "one-shot" efforts. The disconnection between education and job training has been counterproductive for both.[20]

---

[16] Dougherty, *The Contradictory College*, pp. 197-198.

[17] Cantor, *Apprenticeship and Community Colleges*, p. 44.

[18] W. Norton Grubb, *Learning to Work: The Case for Reintegrating Job Training and Education* (New York: Russell Sage Books, 1996), p. 105.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid, p. 106.

The services offered at community colleges and one-stop career center systems are highly complementary. Although some of these services can overlap, duplication can be avoided if proper coordination takes place. In Chapter 5, the report will analyze how community colleges in four states are interfacing with the one-stop career center system.

CHAPTER 5

CASE STUDIES

Over the last five years, the U.S. Congress passed reform initiatives covering adult basic education, school-to-work transition, and the labor market information system in order to move toward a more comprehensive approach to workforce development. In 1995 and 1996, Congress debated the idea of integrating the vast array of education and job training programs through a workforce consolidation bill, but complications and failure to agree on all programs to be consolidated have postponed the passage of such a bill until the fall of 1997 at the earliest. Although no federal bill exists that would create a comprehensive system of workforce development, states and local areas have taken it upon themselves to integrate education and job training, employment services, and welfare programs in an effort to provide seamless services to their clients.

The U.S. Department of Labor facilitated the process for program consolidation at the state and local levels by offering states planning and implementation grants to establish statewide systems for one-stop career centers. States were encouraged to be as creative as possible while following the guidelines set by the Department of Labor. As a result, each state has taken a unique approach to the development of one-stop career centers. In some areas, true integration of services is starting to take place, while in others there simply is colocation of programs. Some states have developed state legislation that spells out the formation of local workforce development boards that would designate one-stop career center sites. Others states have executive orders to develop one-stop career center sites, and still others have neither legislation nor executive order, only state administrative agencies handling the roles of facilitators and developers of the statewide one-stop career center systems.

The role of public community colleges within the one-stop career center system also varies between states. In some states, the role of community colleges is spelled out clearly, while in others the role of the community college is completely amorphous and vague. Deborah Wright of Southwestern Oregon Community College identified six roles of community colleges in the one-stop system:

- training provider;
- the lead agency or facilitator initiating one-stop partnerships;
- coordinator of services at a single or multiple locations where there is a close referral relationship among partners;
- integrator of services using cross-trained personnel;
- fiscal agent; and

- leaser of space to one-stop career centers.[1]

In this chapter, the one-stop career center systems in four states are analyzed in terms of how they interface with their local community colleges. The four states analyzed are Texas, Iowa, North Carolina, and Oregon. Texas, Iowa, and North Carolina have received one-stop implementation grants from the Department of Labor. Oregon has received a planning grant and should receive an implementation grant by July 1997. Two of the states, Texas and Iowa, have legislation that details the composition of one-stop career centers for their states. North Carolina is following an executive order to develop a one-stop career center system, while Oregon sets its one-stop career center system policy through the Oregon Workforce Quality Council, having neither state legislation nor an executive order.

Texas

In 1993, the Texas Legislature passed Senate Bill 642, which created the Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness (TCWEC). Some of TCWEC's mandates were to:

- advocate for the development of an integrated workforce development system;
- recommend to the governor the designation of workforce development areas for local planning and delivery of workforce programs;
- develop and recommend the criteria to the governor for the establishment of local workforce development boards;
- develop and recommend a plan for consolidating all workforce development programs in the state, including those in education; and
- develop and recommend to the governor a single strategic plan for all workforce development programs.[2]

TCWEC applied for and received a one-stop implementation grant in 1994. The one-stop service delivery in Texas is organized around twenty-nine workforce development areas. All twenty-nine areas have applied to establish local workforce development boards, with most of them to be certified by the summer of 1997. The local workforce development boards will provide planning, oversight, evaluation, and implementation of one-stop career centers. When they are certified by the governor, the local workforce development boards must establish one-stop career centers within 180 days.

In the spring of 1995, the Texas Legislature passed House Bill (HB) 1863. In addition to reforming Texas welfare programs, HB 1863 created the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), which consolidates the following job training, employment, and education programs:

---

[1] Telephone Interview by Michael Gutierrez with Deborah G. Wright, Associate Dean of Extended Learning, Southwestern Oregon Community College, Coos Bay, Oregon, March 21, 1997.

[2] Texas Legislature, Senate, *An Act Relating to the Creation of the Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness, the Creation of Local Workforce Development Boards, and the Development of an Integrated State and Local Program Delivery System Serving all Texans*, 73 Leg., 2nd sess., 1993, S.B. 642.

- adult education
- proprietary school programs
- apprenticeship programs
- postsecondary vocational and technical job training programs that are not a part of approved courses or programs that lead to licensing, certification, or associate degrees
- employment programs
- senior citizens employment program
- the work and family policies program
- JTPA
- the job counseling program for displaced homemakers
- the Communities in Schools program
- the reintegration of offenders program
- the continuity of care program
- literacy program funded by the state
- the employment service
- the community service program under the National and Community Service Act of 1990
- the trade adjustment assistance program
- JOBS
- the food stamp employment and training program
- the functions of the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee
- the inmate employment counseling program.[3]

HB 1863 encourages the creation of local workforce development boards and offers block grants to areas that form boards. The development of local workforce development boards and the implementation of one-stop career centers fall under the purview of the TWC. The legislation refers to establishing career development centers, which will serve as the one-stop career centers. These career centers are to serve employers by encompassing the following:

- job referrals
- customized training
- labor market information
- employee testing

---

[3] Texas Legislature, House, *An Act Relating to the Eligibility for and the Provision of Services and Programs for Needy People, Including Children; Assistance in Becoming or Remaining Self-dependent; and the Responsibility of Parents and Others to Assist Needy People, Including Children, in Becoming or Remaining Self-Dependent; Providing Penalties*, 75 Leg., 2nd sess., 1995, H.B. 1863.

- job structuring assistance.[4]

Individual customers will use the network for the following:

- information on job openings
- education and training opportunities
- eligibility determination for all publicly funded workforce training services
- assessment
- centralized case management
- supportive services, such as child care and information on available financial assistance for additional education and training.[5]

Left out of the legislation is the vocational education funding provided through the federal Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990. Although the training programs have been consolidated, the natural funding rift still exists between education and job training. The rift can be alleviated with continued coordination and collaboration between education and job training at the local level.

The role of community colleges in Texas relative to the career centers will depend heavily on the relationships between agency staffs. Good relationships will foster the coordination and collaboration capabilities. HB 1863 requires that the local workforce development board include at least one member from education. This member can represent secondary, postsecondary two-year, or postsecondary four-year institutions. It is up to the chief elected officials, usually the mayor and county officials, to choose the education representative, ultimately making the position a political issue for a process that is aimed at achieving more "depolitization." There is some concern among representatives from community colleges that they could potentially be shut out of the decision making process in their local workforce development areas. They fear that the local workforce development boards will focus their policy on getting the customers of the system employed instead of giving them long-term preparation. According to Norton Grubb, focusing only on short-term training for quick employment results in a long-term decay in earnings for an individual.[6] Many times, these individuals are bypassed in promotions because they still lack the necessary basic skills.

On the other hand, there is nothing that prohibits community and technical colleges from participating in board meetings even if they do not have representatives serving on the local workforce development boards. In fact, the TWC advocates participation from the community and technical colleges on the local workforce development boards.

HB 1863 set up walls to avoid "conflicts of interest" and limit abuse to protect taxpayers. The act states that an organization that provides one-stop services may not also provide developmental services, such as basic education and skills training, although waivers could be granted for this process. This in effect discourages the community and technical colleges from

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

[6] W. Norton Grubb, *Learning to Work: The Case for Reintegrating Job Training and Education* (New York: Russell Sage Books, 1996), p. 111.

serving as the one-stop designees, because they fear a substantial loss in contracts for skills training.

Community college representatives feel that, in certain situations, community and technical colleges are ideal to serve as the career centers in Texas because of their partnerships with business and industry and the wide array of services already being provided, as outlined in Chapter 4. They fear that certain services, such as job placement, could be unnecessarily duplicated. Still, the process does not prevent community and technical colleges from coordinating services with career centers. A few community colleges are providing space for the career centers, with the staffs being completely independent of the colleges. This type of arrangement would allow more active participation between community colleges and one-stop services.

The most common role of the community and technical college in Texas is as the preferred provider for training. Community colleges serve as ideal places for training referrals from career centers because of choices they offer, low cost, and open enrollments. In addition, community colleges partner with businesses to provide students access to new technologies and potential employment. Students would be able to decide in which training program to enroll based on performance data maintained by the career centers.

Despite the positive role community colleges can play within the career center system in Texas, negative perceptions exist. In some areas, the local workforce boards are seen simply as the private industry councils reborn because many of the day-to-day operations are coming from former JTPA service delivery area leadership. Some leaders in community colleges believe that the career centers are going to focus too much on case management instead of long-term, comprehensive services. The reality is that career centers should provide universality, customer choice, integration, and performance-driven outcome-based measures and should not be treated only as places for people seeking welfare or a "second chance." In fact, community colleges will have to fight the misperception that they cannot always be used as a resource by customers of the workforce development system because colleges are only for college-bound students.

Some community colleges provide excellent education, job training, and job placement, but not all programs see getting the students jobs as their main priority. Career exploration and job placement are a major strength of the career centers. To ensure optimum coordination, the community and technical colleges in Texas will have to take it upon themselves to inform career center staffs about all the services available through the community college system.

Iowa

The state of Iowa has been striving for a cohesive workforce development system through legislation since the mid-1980s. To alleviate the number of fragmented education and job training programs, Iowa underwent a major reorganization in 1986. Many state agencies, boards, and commissions were consolidated to a third of the original number. Programs such as JTPA and other state-funded training programs for disadvantaged people were consolidated in Iowa's Department of Economic Development, which provides customized training programs for business and industry delivered by community colleges. This allows for greater cooperation between education, job training, and economic development.

By 1992, Iowa started a process to develop workforce development centers, or the state's version of the one-stop career center system. In 1994, Iowa received a one-stop implementation grant to expand its workforce development centers. In these centers, one can receive services that include career and labor market information, job placement and job-seeking assistance, and information about employment opportunities, job skill requirements, and eligibility under various programs. At a minimum, all workforce development centers integrate program services under the following:

- JTPA Title II and III (Dislocated Worker Program)
- Employment and Unemployment Insurance Services
- JOBS
- Food Stamp Employment and Training
- Employment Services
- Vocational Rehabilitation
- Community Service Employment Program.[7]

Other agencies and programs are strongly encouraged to participate in the centers. Customized business training services provided through the workforce development centers will continue to be delivered by the Iowa community colleges.

Like Texas, Iowa did not wait on the federal government, but developed its own workforce development legislation. In the spring of 1996, Iowa enacted Senate File (SF) 2409, which established the Iowa Workforce Development Department by consolidating workforce development programs and activities of the Department of Employment Services, the Department of Economic Development, and the Department of Human Rights. SF 2409 also established a state workforce development board, workforce development regions, and regional advisory committees.

Iowa's version of one-stop career centers, the workforce development center, will be administered by the newly established Iowa Workforce Development Department at the state level. Its board will set the workforce policy through a strategic plan. Community colleges will play an active role in developing workforce policy at the state level. The Iowa Workforce Development Board will be composed of nine voting members, mainly representing business, industry, and labor, plus seven ex-officio members. One ex-officio member must be a person appointed by the Iowa Association of Community College Presidents.

Iowa designated the fifteen service delivery areas of community colleges as the workforce development areas, another major difference between Texas and Iowa. Thus, the JTPA service delivery structure consisting of sixteen regions must be realigned. A regional advisory boards is to be established in each workforce development area. Chief elected officials within the region, including community college trustees, are among those eligible to make recommendations to the governor for regional board membership. The membership of the boards includes

---

[7] U.S. Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration, "Iowa's One-Stop Career Center System," Washington, D.C. 1995, p. 1 (computer printout).

- equal representation of business and labor;
- a county elected official;
- a representative of a secondary school district; and
- a representative of a community college. [8]

Whereas the Texas legislation does not guarantee a spot on the local workforce development board for community colleges, Iowa ensures representation on the regional advisory board. The regional advisory board and the Iowa Workforce Development Department will identify coordinating service delivery providers through a competitive process for each of the fifteen areas. The coordinating service provider will

- coordinate services within the regional system;
- coordinate with other service providers outside of the workforce development center system;
- report to the regional advisory board and Iowa Workforce Development Department;
- design the workforce development center system (one-stops) based on the needs assessment prepared by the regional advisory board;
- implement the regional workforce development service delivery plan;
- maintain the identity of the workforce development center system; and
- market the workforce development center system. [9]

Nothing precludes community colleges from serving as the coordinating service providers. In fact, some of the community colleges have expressed interest in filling that role because nothing prohibits them from coordinating services while offering customized training to their customers. Three colleges are already applying for positions as the regional directors in charge of coordinating service activities for the community college.

Not all community colleges want to serve as the coordinating service providers. Some merely want to run workforce development centers or coordinate with existing workforce development centers for one-stop activities. In either case, community colleges have mandatory roles. Community colleges will serve as business consulting service providers and could provide other services as needed.

North Carolina

North Carolina does not have state legislation but follows state Executive Order No. 90 to develop local workforce development boards that charter and oversee the JobLink Career Centers (North Carolina's version of a one-stop career center system). Like Iowa, North Carolina's workforce development boards mandate representation from community colleges.

---

[8] Iowa General Assembly, Senate, *An Act Relating to Workforce Development by Establishing a Workforce Development Department, by Eliminating the Department of Employment Services, and Including Workforce Development Programs in the New Department, and by Establishing a Workforce Development Board and Regional Advisory Boards*, 2nd sess., 1996, S.F. 2409.

[9] Ibid.

In 1995, North Carolina received a one-stop implementation grant. At the state level, the Governor's Commission on Workforce Preparedness oversees the JobLink Career Center initiative. At the local level, the private industry councils were transitioned into the local workforce development boards and were given oversight authority for the JobLink Career Centers. Despite the difficulty of developing JobLink Career Centers due to the lack of consolidation of workforce programs at the state level, North Carolina's system has progressed well.

Fifteen of North Carolina's twenty-five workforce development boards now have funds to develop JobLink Career Centers. The goal is to have JobLink Career Centers in every county by the year 2000. The JobLink Career Centers are issued via a competitive grant process. Each proposal for a center must have partnerships and access to services offered by the six key agency partners:

- community colleges
- Employment Security Commission
- JTPA
- JobReady (school-to-work)
- Vocational Rehabilitation
- Work First (social services). [10]

The individual centers can have additional local partnerships with other entities. The core services offered are

- assessment services;
- labor market information;
- information about education and training programs;
- job placement assistance;
- case management assistance; and
- career guidance and counseling. [11]

The workforce development boards are using the Malcolm Baldridge Quality criteria as a framework for local chartering.

Community colleges can apply to serve as JobLink Career Centers, but most centers are being established at the local employment service offices. Nevertheless, community colleges are still regarded as the leaders of classroom and customized training for businesses. They must be included in the development process and not precluded from serving as the designees for colocation of services.

---

[10] Commission on Workforce Preparedness, "North Carolina JobLink Career Center Career Planning, Training and Placement Services," JobLink Career Centers Request for Proposal, North Carolina, September 6, 1996, p. 3.
[11] Ibid, p. 5

Oregon

Oregon received a one-stop planning/development grant in the fall of 1994 and should have implementation funds by July 1997. Oregon has not enacted legislation dealing with the issues of local workforce development boards or the one-stop career centers, but enabling legislation has been written. However, the Workforce Quality Act created the Oregon Workforce Quality Council, which functions as a human resource investment council, and fifteen local counterparts.

The one-stop planning grant is being administered through the Oregon Workforce Quality Council and its fifteen regional committees. The Council at the state level and its fifteen regional committees include representatives of business and labor and the state heads of higher education, community colleges, JTPA, Employment Department, Department of Adult and Family Services, and Department of Human Resources. However, the Oregon Workforce Quality Council will sunset in 1997 and the policy making authority for one-stop career centers will be assumed by the Workforce Policy Cabinet. A one-stop management team composed of agency directors or designees will handle its administrative responsibilities.

At the local level, the fifteen regional workforce quality committees will still exist by statute (SB 917) and will continue to be the regional coordinators for one-stop efforts. Since the committees are composed of all the workforce partners with a private sector majority, they could become workforce development boards under any type of federal or state legislation.

Unlike Texas, Iowa, and North Carolina, Oregon is still in its planning and development phase. It is difficult to gauge the role of community colleges across the board in Oregon because a statewide system of one-stop career centers has not been agreed upon. Those areas with established one-stops do involve community colleges in some way, but not always directly. As in the other three states that have been analyzed, community colleges serve as the training entities. In some areas of Oregon, the community college serves as the full-fledged one-stop career centers. Southwestern Oregon Community College has developed a 35,500-square-foot one-stop center, and a 6,200-square-foot family center on its campus. This entity is called the Newmark Career and Opportunity One-Stop Center. Services are being provided by the following:

- Adult and Family Services
- Southwestern Oregon Community Action
- Ambit alcohol and drug treatment program
- Southwestern Oregon Community College's Workforce 2000, Adult Basic Education, and Business Development Center
- Consumer Credit Counseling Services
- Department of Human Resources volunteer program
- Women's Crisis Service
- JOBS
- Vocational Rehabilitation
- Employment Department

- Services to Children and Families
- South Coast Regional Workforce Quality Committee. [12]

The staff is cross-trained to assist every client, use a common database, and share resources. The Newmark Center will provide one-stop career center development training for Oregon and for those interested in the Newmark Center model from throughout the United States.

[12] Southwestern Oregon Community College, "Newmark Career & Opportunity One-Stop Center," Briefing Paper by Deborah G. Wright, Coos Bay, Oregon, December 1996, p. 2.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The role of community colleges within one-stop career centers varies from state to state, region to region. The common thread is that community colleges are providing customized professional and technical training referred to them by the one-stop career centers. In some areas, the community colleges also serve as the one-stop career centers.

Community colleges have advantages, because they already have an administrative structure to administer large grants and are considered resource-rich in terms of their infrastructure, especially compared to many community-based organizations or agency offices. Such a scenario will allow customers of the one-stop career centers to use all the community college resources. Moreover, community college students will have full access to the career exploration and job placement services administered through the one-stop career centers.

The criticism of community colleges serving as the one-stop career centers is that they generally have poor job placement programs and tend to care only about educating or training an individual. Some feel that, if community colleges serve as one-stop career centers, they will have to recognize that classroom training alone would not be enough. Training strategies would have to include on-the-job training and on-site training. Of course, many community colleges already advocate such methods.

Community colleges feel that the job training programs and employment services focus too much on job placement to help meet mandated performance standards or that they simply do case management. Some community colleges feel that they will be "dumbing down" by working with one-stop career centers.

To a certain extent, all parties are correct. However, this country cannot achieve true integration of services without partnerships, coordination and collaboration, and professional development. Colocation of services does not guarantee a seamless delivery of services. The history of education and job training shows that they have been separated by funding streams and mission. True integration in workforce development requires a paradigm shift, which will not and cannot happen overnight after decades of a fragmented workforce development system.

Whether colocating, sharing some staff, or cross-training all personnel in a "no wrong door approach," one-stops will need to transition those in short-term training programs into longer term programs. The community colleges should be the link that unites education and job training. They do not need to serve as the sites for every one-stop career center to be that link, but they should collaborate to ensure a coherent workforce development system.

Recommendations

1. *Pass federal block grant legislation.*
   A recurring theme at the one-stop career centers is the need to reduce administrative paperwork from all the consolidated programs. Moreover, it is believed that block grants will force areas to consolidate and ease accounting requirements. Block grants will free states from federal regulations and allow them to combine their vocational education, job training, and adult education programs in a coherent workforce development system.

2. *Allow a sliding scale for services.*
   Too many customers seeking services "fall through the cracks." Many do not have enough barriers to qualify for JTPA, or they make just enough money not to qualify for welfare. A sliding scale will allow customers seeking skill upgrading some services instead of no services at all. Some private colleges and universities use a similar method by offering only need-based financial aid. The current workforce development system serves those who are hard to serve and those who are able to work and educate themselves simultaneously. The staffs at one-stop career centers are frustrated because services are limited for those individuals classified as the working poor, although many times they are the most motivated to better their current position in society.

3. *Market the one-stop career center system*
   The lack of knowledge or misunderstanding about one-stop career centers is two-fold. First, the customers of the workforce development system are either unaware of their existence or see it as a service provider for the unemployed or the hard-to-serve. One-stop career centers do much more than PICs or offices for the local employment service. People who are college bound or looking for career changes can also benefit from the one-stop career centers. Second, educators in the secondary and postsecondary areas are not entirely sure as to their role within the one-stop career center system. Many feel that one-stop career centers are strictly for case management and short-term training.

4. *Link the one-stop, school-to-work, and skill standards development initiatives.*
   The one-stop career centers can be the mechanism to link workforce development and people transitioning into the employment world through their labor market information, career exploration, and job placement services. One-stop career centers can also advance the use of industry-driven skill standards advocated by the National Skill Standards Board and State Skill Standards Boards by referring customers to training providers who have updated or created curricula based on industry-validated skill standards.

5. *Make community colleges the preferred provider of training services for the one-stop career centers.*
   Community colleges should be at the table as critical partners in job preparation, basic skills, and technical training. Community colleges already provide these services at a low cost in many different technical areas. Allowing community colleges to serve as the preferred providers of training services will help transition customers of the workforce development system from short-term training programs into long-term training.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin-Travis County Workforce Development Board Planning Team. "A Planning Guide for the Establishment of a Local Workforce Development Board and a System of One-Stop Career Centers." Final Report. Austin, July 31, 1995.

Bober, Pete, Director of Workforce and Economic Development, Linn-Benton Community College, Albany, Oregon. Phone Interview, March 18, 1996.

Bragg, D.D., R.E. Hamm, and K. A. Trinkle. "Work-Based Learning in Two-Year Colleges in the United States." Berkeley: University of California, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1993.

Brown, Jill. Project Manager, Lockheed Martin IMS, Dallas, Texas. Phone Interview, March 9, 1997.

Callison, JoAnn. Public Service Executive, Iowa Workforce Development, Des Moines, Iowa. Phone Interview, March 17, 1997.

Cantor, Jeffrey A. *Apprenticeship and Community Colleges: Promoting Collaboration with Business, Labor and the Community for Workforce Training.* Lanham: University Press of America, 1993.

Carnevale, Anthony P. *America and the New Economy.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1991.

Carnevale, Anthony P., Leila J. Gainer, and Janice Villet. *Training in America: The Organization and Strategic Role and Training.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.

Carreon, Susan. "Preparing for the 21st Century: Factors Which Will Influence Community College Workforce Development." Available from http://www.umt.edu/ncoe/summer1.htm; INTERNET.

Clary, Karen. Director of JTPA, Mid-East Commission, Washington, North Carolina. Phone Interview, March 9, 1997.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Projecting the Future of Community Colleges." Los Angeles: *ERIC Digest,* 1996.

Collins, Lisa. Workforce Development Planner, Dallas County Workforce Development Board, Dallas, Texas. Phone Interview, March 9, 1996.

Commission on Workforce Preparedness. "Biennial Report: July 1, 1993-June 30, 1995." Biennial Report. Raleigh, North Carolina, March 27, 1995

Commission on Workforce Preparedness. "North Carolina JobLink Career Center Career Planning, Training, & Placement Services." JobLink Career Centers Request for Proposal. Raleigh, North Carolina, September 6, 1996.

Curry, Ron. Program Director, Workforce Education, Community and Technical Colleges Division, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. E-Mail Interview, March 19, 1997.

Dougherty, Kevin J. *The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.

Faulkner, Lydia A. Programs/Policy Associate, Commission on Workforce Preparedness, Raleigh, North Carolina. Phone Interview. March 16, 1997.

Gabert, Glen. *Community Colleges in the 1990s.* Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1991.

Grubb, W. Norton. *Learning to Work: The Case for Re-integrating Education and Job Training.* New York: Russell Sage Books, 1996.

Grubb, W. Norton. *The Returns to Education and Training in the Sub-Baccalaureate Labor Market: Evidence from the Survey of Income and Program Participation, 1984-1990.* Berkeley: University of California, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1995.

Grubb, W. Norton. *Working in the Middle: Strengthening Education and Training for the Mid-Skilled Labor Force.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996.

Hayes, Homer. Dean of Workforce Development, Alamo Community College District and President of the Texas Association of Collegiate Technical Educators, San Antonio, Texas. Phone Interview, December 16, 1996.

Hirshberg, Diane. "The Role of the Community College in Economic and Workforce Development." Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, December 1991.

Hull, Dan, and Dale Parnell. *Tech Prep Associate Degree: A Win/Win Experience.* Waco: Center for Occupational Research and Development, 1991.

Iowa General Assembly, Senate. *An Act Relating to Workforce Development by Establishing a Workforce Development Department, by Eliminating the Department of Employment Services, and Including Workforce Development Programs in the New Department, and by Establishing a Workforce Development Board and Regional Advisory Boards.* 1996, S.F. 2409.

Iowa Workforce Development. "An Introduction to Regional Assessment and Analysis." Prepared by the Enterprise Development Team, February 26, 1997.

Iowa Workforce Development. "Boundaries for Workforce Development." Briefings from the Workforce Development Board Meeting, October 29-30, 1996.

Iowa Workforce Development. "Iowa Workforce Development Proposed Competitive Service Delivery Model." Prepared by the Enterprise Development Team, January 22, 1997.

Iowa Workforce Development. "Proposal for Changing Iowa's Workforce Development System and Structure: Question and Answer." Report prepared by Dennis Guffey, Workforce Development Coordinator, Des Moines, Iowa, November 30, 1996.

McDonnell, Lorraine M., and W. Norton Grubb. *Education and Training for Work: The Policy Instruments and the Institutions*. Berkeley: University of California, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1991.

National Center on Education and the Economy, *America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department Of Labor, 1991.

New American High School Conference. "Investing in People Good for Us as a Nation, Says Secretary of Labor." Speech by Robert Reich, 1996.

Ovel, Steve. Executive Director for Governmental Relations and Assistant to the President, Kirkwood Community College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Phone Interview, March 9, 1997.

Perry, Don. Assistant District Director, Dallas County Community College District, Dallas, Texas. Interview, December 16, 1996.

Perry, Don. President of the Texas Association of Postsecondary Occupational Education Administrators. Memorandum to Acting Assistant Commissioner Dr. Bob Lahti, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, April 15, 1994.

Rogers, Leslie. Director of JobLink Career Center and Assistant Dean Of Students, Pitt Community College, Greenville, North Carolina. Phone Interview, March 16, 1997.

Saylor, Collette. Training Consultant, Des Moines Area Community College, Des Moines, Iowa. Phone Interview, March 9, 1997.

Southwestern Oregon Community College. "Newmark Career & Opportunity One-Stop Center." Briefing Paper by Deborah George Wright. Coos Bay, Oregon, December 1996.

State of North Carolina. "Executive Order No. 90: Establishment of Workforce Development Boards." Raleigh, North Carolina, December 5, 1995.

Svenson, Sonja. Workforce Policy Analyst, Office of Educational Policy and Planning/Workforce Quality Council, Salem, Oregon. Phone Interview, December 16, 1996.

Texas Legislature, House. *An Act Relating to the Eligibility for and the Provision of Services and Programs for Needy People, Including Children; Assistance in Becoming or Remaining Self-dependent; and the Responsibility of Parents and Others to Assist Needy People, Including Children, in Becoming or Remaining Self-dependent; Providing Penalties*, 75 Leg., 1995, H.B. 1863.

Texas Legislature, Senate. *An Act Relating to the Creation of the Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness, the Creation of Local Workforce Development Boards, and the Development of an Integrated State and Local Program Delivery System Serving all Texans.* 73 Leg., 1993, S.B. 642.

Texas Workforce Center. *Welcome to the Texas Workforce Center.* Dallas, Texas (Undated Brochure).

Texas Workforce Commission. *Texas' One-Stop Career Center Grant.* Austin, Texas, 1996.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. "Iowa's One-Stop Career Center System." Washington, D.C., 1995 (computer printout).

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. "North Carolina's One-Stop Career Center System." Washington, D.C., 1995 (computer printout).

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. "Texas' One-Stop Career Center System." Washington, D.C., 1995 (computer printout).

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. *The One-Stop Career Center System Fact Sheet.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, April, 5 1995.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, One-Stop Center Team. *Common Eligibility & Information Sharing Across Agencies.* National One-Stop Implementation Conference Minutes. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor. August 1995.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, One-Stop Center Team. *Employers' Fears, Wants & Needs.* National One-Stop Implementation Conference Minutes. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, August 1995.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, One-Stop Center Team. *Integrated Service Delivery for a Universal Population.* National One-Stop Implementation Conference Minutes. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, August 1995.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, One-Stop Center Team. *One-Stop Career Center "System-Building/America's Labor Market Information System: A March 1996 Update from ETA.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, March 1996.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, One-Stop Center Team. *One-Stop Quarterly Report: An Update on the Status of Employment and Training System Building.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, October 1995.

U.S. Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration, One-Stop Center Team. *One-Stop Quarterly Report: An Update on the Status of Employment and Training System Building.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, January 1996.

U.S. Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration, *One-Stop Quarterly Report: An Update on the Status of Employment and Training System Building.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, June 1996.

Vaughan, Roger J. "Education, Training, and Labor Markets: A Policy Perspective." *NCEE Brief,* Number 8 (August 1990).

Wenrich, Bill. Chancellor, Dallas County Community College District and Member of the Dallas County Workforce Development Board, Dallas, Texas. E-Mail Interview, December 19, 1996.

Wetterskog, Rodney. Director of the North Central Texas Tech Prep Consortium, Dallas, Texas. Interview on March 9, 1997.

Wright, Deborah George. Associate Dean of Extended Learning, Southwestern Oregon Community College, Coos Bay, Oregon. Phone Interview, March 17, 1997.

Wyckoff-Byers, Julie. Program Director of Employment and Jobs Services, Portland Community College, Portland, Oregon. Phone Interview, March 18, 1996.